

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/386,000

B. Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement ("IDS") on January 4, 2001, after the mailing date of the present Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide an initialed copy of the Form 1449 attached to the IDS with the next Office Action.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 13-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant submits that the amendments to claim 13 overcome the rejection.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S.P. 5,187,532 to McNew ("McNew")

Claims 13, 16, and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McNew. Applicant submits that claim 13 is patentable over the cited reference.

For example, claim 13 states that the plurality of paper rolls are arranged obliquely relative to the vertical direction. On the other hand, McNew clearly does not disclose or suggest such feature and thus, does not anticipate the claim or render it obvious. Furthermore, since claims 16 and 17 depend upon claim 13, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

RECEIVED
APR 06 2001
3600 MAIL ROOM

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S.P. 5,690,774 to Greene (“Greene”)

Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Greene. Applicant submits that the claims are patentable over the cited references.

For example, claim 13 recites a large printer having a sheet feeding area positioned at a height where a user can set up a printing medium without bending at the waist. Since Greene does not suggest the feature above, Applicant submits that claim 13 is not anticipated and would not have been obvious. Also, since claim 14 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection of such claim is moot.

V. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S.P. 5,072,306 to Matsumoto et al. (“Matsumoto”)

Claims 13 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsumoto. Applicant submits that the claims are patentable.

As noted above, claim 13 recites a large printer having a sheet feeding area positioned at a height where a user can set up a printing medium without bending at the waist. Since Matsumoto does not suggest the feature above, Applicant submits that claim 13 is not anticipated and would not have been obvious. Also, since claim 15 contains features that are similar to the features discussed above in conjunction with claim 13, Applicant submits that claim 15 is patentable for reasons that are similar to why claim 13 is patentable.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/386,000

VI. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S.P. 938,885 to McCulley (“McCulley”)

Claims 13, 17, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McCulley. Applicant submits that the claims are patentable over the references.

For example, since McCulley does not suggest a large printer having a sheet feeding area positioned at a height where a user can set up a printing medium without bending at the waist, Applicant submits that claim 13 is patentable. Furthermore, since claims 17 and 18 depend upon claim 13, such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

VII. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S.P. 5,838,354 to Yamada et al. (“Yamada”)

Claims 13, 16, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada. Applicant submits that the claims are patentable over the references.

For example, since Yamada does not suggest a large printer having a sheet feeding area positioned at a height where a user can set up a printing medium without bending at the waist, Applicant submits that claim 13 is patentable. Furthermore, since claims 16 and 18 depend upon claim 13, such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

VIII. Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/386,000

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Grant K. Rowan
Registration No. 41,278

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Date: April 3, 2001

• AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/386,000

APPENDIX

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

The claims have been amended in the following manner.

13. A large printer comprising:

a sheet feeding area positioned at a height at which a user standing in front of the printer can [easily] set up a printing medium without having to bend substantially at the waist,

wherein a plurality of paper rolls are loaded in the sheet feeding area so as to be arranged obliquely relative to each other in the vertical direction.

15. [The large printer as set forth in claim 13,] A large printer comprising:

a sheet feeding area positioned at a height at which a user standing in front of the printer can set up a printing medium without having to bend substantially at the waist.

wherein the printing medium includes at least one roll of paper and at least one sheet of stiff carton, and

wherein the sheet feeding area includes an accommodation space in which the paper roll is loaded and a cover member for covering the accommodation space from above and for supporting the stiff carton from below.